

Message Text

PAGE 01 NATO 02423 01 OF 03 302244Z

63

ACTION SS-25

INFO OCT-01 ISO-00 SSO-00 NSCE-00 INRE-00 DODE-00 CIAE-00

/026 W

----- 114618

P 301815 Z APR 75

FM USMISSION NATO

TO SECSTATE WASHDC PRIORITY 1542

USDEL SALT TWO GENEVA PRIORITY

S E C R E T SECTION 1 OF 3 USNATO 2423

EXDIS

E.O. 11652: GDS

TAGS: PFOR, NATO

SUBJECT: NAC CONSULTATION ON SALT

REF: A. USNATO 2367

B. SALT TWO GENEVA 0185

1. AS A FOLLOW UP TO APRIL 29 MEETING BETWEEN AMBASSADOR AND AMBASSADOR CATALANO (ITALY) REGARDING A NAC SALT BREIFING (REFTEL A), POLAD HELD FURTHER DISCUSSIONS WITH ITALIAN DELEGATION (CIARRAPICO). CIARRAPICO SAID THAT PAPER AMBASSADOR CATALANO HAD PROMISED TO PROVIDE AMBASSADOR BRUCE COULD NOT BE RELEASED TO THE AMERICAN DELEGATION AS YET BECAUSE OF OF PRESUMABLY SOME SMALL CHANGE WHICH HAD TO BE MADE IN IT. HE DID, HOWEVER, OFFER TO HAVE POLAD READ THE REPORT AND TAKE NOTES ON IT. HE LATER POROVIDED POLAD A COPY OF THE PAPER ON A PERSONAL CONFIDENTIAL BASIS. PLEASE PROTECT.

2. THE PETRIGINI GROUP INDICATES THE ALLIES WILL BE INTERESTED IN DISCUSSING THE FOLLOWING:

- NON CENTRAL SYSTEMS (FBS);
- DEFINITION SOF WEAPONS SYSTEMS;
- NON TRANSFER;
- NON CIRCUMVENTION.

SECRET

PAGE 02 NATO 02423 01 OF 03 302244Z

3. TEXT FOLLOWS: BEGIN TEXT

GUIDELINES FOR DISCUSSION ON SALT

THE QUESTION OF NON CENTRAL SYSTEMS (FBS)

THE MEMBERS OF THE GROUP MAY WANT TO INDICATE TO THE USA THAT THEY HAVE TAKEN ATTENTIVE NOTE OF THE FACT THAT THE SIVET SIDE INTENDS TO RAISE THE QUESTION OF FBS IN THE FRAMEWORK OF THE SUBSEQUENT NEGOTIATIONS ON REDUCTIONS. THEY MAY WANT TO RECOMMEND THAT SUCH ADVANCE NOTICE BE MET AS OF NOW BY THE US, WITH A FIRM REJECTION. THE EXISTING ATTITUDE WHICH THEUS HAS ADOPTED, IN FULL CONSULTATION AND AGREEMENT WITH ITS EUROPEAN ALLIES, SHOULD BE MAINTAINED AND RECONFIRMED.

"DEFINITIONS" OF WEAPON SYSTEMS

WE RECOGNIZE THAT, AS STATED BY THE US DELEGATION AT THE SALT TALKS, ONE OF THE SUBSTANTIVE DIFFICULTIES OF THE PRESNET ROUND OF NEGOTIATIONS WILL LIE IN ARRIVING AT SATISFACTORY DEFINITIONS OF THE WEAPON SYSTEMS TO BE LIMITED BY AN AGREEMENT. THIS ISSUE CLEARLY AFFECTS EUROPEAN INTERESTS INASMUCH AS ANY AMBIGUITY IN SUCH AGREED DEFINITIONS MAY HAVE DANGEROUS IMPLICATIONS FOR DEFENCE CAPABILITIES OF DIRECT CONCERN TO THE EUROPEANS. NOTHING IN THE AGREEMENT SHOULD CONSTRAIN THE AREA OF TECHNOLOGICAL PROGRESS, WHICH REMAINS A BASIC ASSET OF WESTERN SECURITY. MOREOVER CARE SHOULD BE TAKEN TO AVOID LANGUAGE WHETHER IN DEFINITIONA OR VERIFICATION MEASURES OR OTHERWISE WHICH MIGHT PREJUDICE ALLEID INTERESTS IN OTHER DISARMAMENT NEGOTIATIONS. IN THE LIGHT OF THESE CONSIDERATIONS AND OF ANY FURTHER INDICATION OF AMERICAN VIEWS ON THIS SUBJECT IT APPEARS ADVISABLE:

- (1) TO STRESS THAT DEFINITIONS OF SYSTEMS LIMITED BY THE AGREEMENT SHOULD BE EXPRESSED IN TERMS OF SPECIFIC NAMED TYPES (EG "BISON AND BACKFIRE") RATHER THAN BY GENERAL CATEGORIES (EG "HEAVY BOMBERS") OR ACCORDING TO PARTICULAR CRITERIA (EG BY RANGE OR PAYLOAD.) OTHER STRATEGIC SYSTEMS, EG FOLLOW ON SYSTEMS, WOULD LOGICALLY BE THE SUBJECT OF FURTHER NEGOTIATIONS BETWEEN THE TWO SIDES. IN THIS WAY THE OPPORTUNITIES FOR THE RUSSIANS TO SEEK TO INCLUDE ADDITIONAL US OR ALLIED SYSTEMS WITHIN THE SCOPE OF THE CHOSEN DEFINITIONS WOULD BE REDUCED TO THE MINIMUM;

SECRET

PAGE 03 NATO 02423 01 OF 03 302244Z

- (2) TO SUBMIT TO THE AMERICANS THE TENTATIVE LISTS ATTACHED AT ANNEX AND TO SEEK THEIR VIEWS ON THEM.

" NO TRANSFER CLAUSE"

THE US SHOULD BE ADVISED THAT THEIR EUROPEAN ALLIES WOULD CONSIDER THE INCLUSION IN THE AGREEMENT OF ANY " NO TRANSFER" CLAUSE AS EXTREMELY PREJUDICIAL TO THE COMMON DEFENCE AND SECURITY INTERESTS. ANY AGREEMENT SHOULD NOT CONSTRAIN:

- (1) POSSIBLE FUTURE COLLABORATION BETWEEN THE AMERICANS AND THE EUROPEAN ALLIES IN THE SUPPLY OR MANUFACTURE OF NEW GENERATIONS OF STRATEGIC DELIVERY SYSTEMS;

SECRET

PAGE 01 NATO 02423 02 OF 03 310040Z

63

ACTION SS-25

INFO OCT-01 ISO-00 SSO-00 NSCE-00 INRE-00 DODE-00 CIAE-00

/026 W

----- 115874

P 301815Z APR 75

FM USMISSION NATO

TO SECSTATE WASHDC PRIORITY 1543

USDEL SALT TWO GENEVA PRIORITY

S E C R E T SECTION 2 OF 3 USNATO 2423

EXDIS

- (2) THE PROSPECTS OF EUROPEAN UNIFICATION;
- (3) THE US ABILITY TO SUPPLY THE ALLIES WITH CERTAIN AIRCRAFT (EG F4 AND F111) AND TACTICAL MISSILE SYSTEMS (EG PERSHING) AND FOLLOW ON SYSTEMS OF BOTH AIRCRAFT AND MISSILES WHICH THE RUSSIANS MIGHT CLAIM TO BE "STRATEGIC" WITHIN THE TERMS OF THE AGREEMENT;
- (4) THE TRANSFER OF SYSTEMS OF WIDER MILITARY APPLICATION EVEN THOUGH THEY HAVE A STRATEGIC SYSTEMS APPLICATION ALSO;
- (5) THE TRANSFER OF TECHNOLOGY IN ALL FIELDS WHERE THIS IS NOT INTENDED FOR THE PRODUCTION OF SYSTEMS LIMITED BY THE AGREEMENT;
- (6) THE TRANSFER OF TECHNICAL DESCRIPTIONS OR PLANS FOR THE DESIGN OR IMPROVEMENT OF SYSTEMS OR SUB SYSTEMS DESTINED FOR RESEARCH AND PEACEFUL USE (ELECTRONIC SUB SYSTEMS, AUXILIARY SYSTEMS CAPABLE OF BEING USED FOR THE LAUNCHING OR TAKEOFF, LANDING OR MAINTENANCE OF MISSILES AND AIRCRAFT;
- (7) CONTINUED US SUPPORT FOR THE BRITISH CONTRIBUTION TO NATO'S STRATEGIC STRENGTH UNDER EXISTING ARRANGEMENTS.

IT APPEARS THAT A "NO TRANSFER" CLAUSE WHICH MIGHT CONCILIATE SUCH DIVERSE AND SIDE RANGING REQUIREMENTS IS HIGHLY HYPOTHETICAL, AND THAT NO FORMULATION CAN CONCEIVABLY COVER ALL THESE ESSENTIAL AREAS. NO RECIPROCAL BENEFIT IS MOREOVER TO BE EXPECTED FROM THE EASTERN SIDE, AS NO SIGNIFICANT TRANSFER OF SECRET

PAGE 02 NATO 02423 02 OF 03 310040Z

STRATEGIC WEAPONRY AND TECHNOLOGY FROM THE USSR TO ITS ALLIES IS TO BE EXPECTED. ANY CONSTRAINT OF THIS NATURE WOULD IN PRACTICE TURN TO THE DISADVANTAGE OF THE WEST.

WE SHOULD THEREFORE STRESS TO THE US OUR EXPECTATION THAT ANY SOCIETY REQUEST FOR A "NO TRANSFER" CLAUSE WOULD BE MET BY A

FIRM REJECTION. IF NECESSARY, THE US MAY WISH TO ARGUE THAT BOTH THE US AND THE USSR HAVE OBLIGATIONS UNDER THE NON PROLIFERATION TREATY THAT ALREADY DEAL SATISFACTORILY WITH ANY RELEVANT "NO TRANSFER" REQUIREMENT. IF ESSENTIAL, PROLONGED SOVIET INSISTENCE ON THIS ISSUE COULD BE MET BY CONSIDERATION OF AN EVENTUAL GENERALIZED "NON-CIRCUMVENTION" CLAUSE, AS INDICATED BELOW.

"NON- CIRCUMVENTION" CLAUSE

IN GENERAL TERMS, IT MAY BE OBSERVED THAT A "NON-CIRCUMVENTION" CLAUSE WITHIN A SALT AGREEMENT COULD PROVE EQUALLY HARMFUL FOR EUROPEAN INTERESTS, AS A "TRANSFER" CLAUSE. ANY FORMULA OF "NON CIRCUMVENTION" MAY PRESENT THE RISK OF RE-INTRODUCING INTO THE NEGOTIATION THE ISSUE OF COMPENSATION FOR THE EXCLUSION OF NON CENTRAL SYSTEMS OR THIRD COUNTRY NUCLEAR FORCES. ALTHOUGH A "NON- CIRCUMVENTION" CLAUSE COULD PLACE USEFUL CONSTRAINTS ON THE WARSAW PACT, IT WOULD ALSO RESTRICT FLEXIBILITY IN SUCH AREAS ESSENTIAL TO NATO SECURITY AS WEAPONS DESIGN, PROCUREMENT AND DEPLOYMENT AS WELL AS IN CONTINGENCY PLANNING. THE BENEFITS TO BE DERIVED BY POSSIBLE CONSTRAINTS ON SOVIET NON CENTRAL SYSTEMS TARGETED ON WESTERN EUROPE, AS THINGS STAND AT PRESENT, WOULD NOT REPRESENT ADEQUATE COMPENSATION FOR THE LOSS OF FLEXIBILITY IN THE USE OF NON CENTRAL SYSTEMS ON WHICH ALLIANCE SECURITY RELIES SO HEAVILY.

IN THE ULTIMATE ANALYSIS, A NEGATIVE US REACTION TO EVENTUAL SOVIET INITIATIVES BOTH ON NON TRANSFER AND ON NON CIRCUMVENTION WOULD BE THE OPTIMAL ANSWER TO BASIC EUROPEAN REQUIREMENTS. HOWEVER, AS INDICATED ABOVE, IF SOME CONCESSION WAS NECESSARY IN RESPONSE TO SOVIET PRESSURE FOR A NON TRANSFER CLAUSE WE CAN ENVISAGE A GENERALIZED NON CIRCUMVENTION CLAUSE AS A FALL BACK POSITION. THIS SHOULD BE SUBJECT TO CERTAIN CONDITIONS BEARING IN MIND, NOT LEAST, ITS POTENTIAL EFFECT IN RELATION TO SALT III.

A "NONCIRCUMVENTION" CLAUSE SHOULD BE SO WORDED AS TO AVOID THE RISKS MENTIONED ABOVE. ALSO IT SHOULD NOT LEAVE ROOM TO INTERPRETATIONS CONFLICTING WITH THE PROSPECTS AND REQUIREMENTS
SECRET

PAGE 03 NATO 02423 02 OF 03 310040Z

OF EUROPEAN UNIFICATION. NOR SHOULD IT BE IN ANY WAY INCOMPATIBLE WITH EXISTING INTERNATIONAL OBLIGATIONS WHICH MAY HAVE TO BE SAFEGUARDED BY A SEPARATE CLAUSE.

THE WHOLE PROBLEM, AS ALREADY INDICATED BY THE US DELEGATION, WOULD IN ANY CASE BE THE SUBJECT OF CONSULTATION IN THE NORTH ATLANTIC COUNCIL (PARAGRAPH 4 OF THE ANNEX TO PO/73/1, DATED 5 JANUARY 1973).

SECRET

PAGE 01 NATO 02423 03 OF 03 010122Z

ACTION SS-25

INFO OCT-01 ISO-00 SSO-00 NSCE-00 INRE-00 DODE-00 CIAE-00

/026 W

----- 116443

P 301815Z APR 75

FM USMISSION NATO

TO SECSTATE WASHDC PRIORITY 1544

USDEL SALT TWO GENEVA PRIORITY

S E C R E T SECTION 3 OF 3 USNATO 2423

EXDIS

INTER-CONTINENTAL BALLISTIC MISSILES

ANNEX A

US USSR EUROPE

A. LAUNCHED FROM SILOS

USSR SYSTEMS

SS-7 (SADDLER) COUNT COUNT COUNT

SS-8 (SASIN) COUNT COUNT COUNT

SS-9 (SCARP) (HEAVY) COUNT COUNT COUNT

SS-11 (SEGO) COUNT COUNT COUNT

SS-13 (SAVAGE) COUNT COUNT COUNT

SS-16 COUNT COUNT COUNT

SS-17 COUNT COUNT COUNT

SS-18 (HEAVY) COUNT COUNT COUNT

SS-19 COUNT COUNT COUNT

US SYSTEMS

TITAN (IF STILL IN SERVICE) COUNT COUNT COUNT

MINUTEMAN 1, 2, 3 COUNT COUNT COUNT

MX (IF DEVELOPED) COUNT COUNT COUNT

B. ICBMS LAUNCHED FROM BOMBERS

ALL MISSILES IN SECTION A COUNT COUNT COUNT

(IF DEVELOPED IN THIS MODE)

SECRET

PAGE 02 NATO 02423 03 OF 03 010122Z

C. ICBMS LAUNCHED FROM AIRCRAFT

OTHER THAN BOMBERS

ALL MISSILES IN SECTION A COUNT FORBIDDEN COUNT

(IF DEVELOPED IN THIS MODE)

D. ICBMS DEPLOYED IN LAND

MOBILE MODE

SS-16 (IF SO DEVELOPED) UNCLEAR COUNT COUNT IF

WHETHER PERMITTED

PERMITTED

OR NOT.
COUNT IF
PERMITTED.

OTHER DELIVERY SYSTEMS

US USSR EUROPE

E. HEAVY BOMBERS

BISON AND BEAR	COUNT	COUNT	COUNT
BACKFIRE	COUNT	DO NOT	COUNT
	COUNT		
B1	COUNT	COUNT	COUNT
B52	COUNT	COUNT	COUNT

F. SUBMARINE LAUNCHED BALLISTIC

MISSILES

SS-N-5	COUNT ON	COUNT ON	COUNT ON
	H-CLASS	H-CLASS	H-CLASS
	SUBS	SUBS	SUBS
SS-N-6	COUNT	COUNT	COUNT
SS-N-8	COUNT	COUNT	COUNT
POLARIS	COUNT	COUNT	COUNT
POSEIDON	COUNT	COUNT	COUNT
TRIDENT	COUNT	COUNT	COUNT

(NOT
MORE THAN
240 PERMIT-
TED.)

G. CRUISE MISSILES -
SECRET

PAGE 03 NATO 02423 03 OF 03 010122Z

AIR LAUNCHED
(RANGE IN EXCESS OF
600 KM)

USSR CRUISE MISSILES	DO NOT	WOULD	DO NOT
	COUNT	COUNT IF	COUNT
	ANY DEVELO-		
	PED WITH		
	RANGE GREATER		
	THAN 600 KM		
US CRUISE MISSILES	DO NOT	COUNT	DO NOT
	COUNT	COUNT	

H. CRUISE MISSILES -

SUBMARINE LAUNCHED
(RANGE IN EXCESS OF 600 KM)

NONE IN EXISTENCE AT	?	COUNT	?
----------------------	---	-------	---

PRESENT

I. CRUISE MISSILES -

LAUNCHED FROM SHIPS

OTHER THAN SUBMARINES

(RANGE IN EXCESS OF 600 KM)

NONE IN EXISTENCT AT

PRESENT ? FORBIDDEN ?

J. INTERCONTINENTAL

CRUISE MISSILES

(RANGE IN EXCESS OF

3,000 MILES) COUNT FORBIDDEN COUNT

END TEXT.

BRUCE

SECRET

<< END OF DOCUMENT >>

Message Attributes

Automatic Decaptioning: Z
Capture Date: 18 AUG 1999
Channel Indicators: n/a
Current Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Concepts: n/a
Control Number: n/a
Copy: SINGLE
Draft Date: 30 APR 1975
Decaption Date: 28 MAY 2004
Decaption Note: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Action: RELEASED
Disposition Approved on Date:
Disposition Authority: GarlanWA
Disposition Case Number: n/a
Disposition Comment: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Date: 28 MAY 2004
Disposition Event:
Disposition History: n/a
Disposition Reason:
Disposition Remarks:
Document Number: 1975NATO002423
Document Source: ADS
Document Unique ID: 00
Drafter: n/a
Enclosure: n/a
Executive Order: 11652 GDS
Errors: n/a
Film Number: n/a
From: NATO
Handling Restrictions: n/a
Image Path:
ISecure: 1
Legacy Key: link1975/newtext/t197504101/abbrzjsi.tel
Line Count: 339
Locator: TEXT ON-LINE
Office: n/a
Original Classification: SECRET
Original Handling Restrictions: EXDIS
Original Previous Classification: n/a
Original Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Page Count: 7
Previous Channel Indicators:
Previous Classification: SECRET
Previous Handling Restrictions: EXDIS
Reference: A. USNATO 2367 B. SALT TWO GENEVA 0185
Review Action: RELEASED, APPROVED
Review Authority: GarlanWA
Review Comment: n/a
Review Content Flags:
Review Date: 30 APR 2003
Review Event:
Review Exemptions: n/a
Review History: RELEASED <30 APR 2003 by CunninFX>; APPROVED <21 JUL 2003 by GarlanWA>
Review Markings:

Margaret P. Grafeld
Declassified/Released
US Department of State
EO Systematic Review
05 JUL 2006

Review Media Identifier:
Review Referrals: n/a
Review Release Date: n/a
Review Release Event: n/a
Review Transfer Date:
Review Withdrawn Fields: n/a
Secure: OPEN
Status: NATIVE
Subject: NAC CONSULTATION ON SALT
TAGS: PFOR, NATO
To: STATE
SALT TWO GENEVA
Type: TE
Markings: Margaret P. Grafeld Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 05 JUL 2006